

As explained in my comments, most users of *Pan* Oken, are not concerned or even aware of the status of the name. The vast majority tend to accept zoological names in good faith from secondary sources.

To my knowledge, no author of any taxonomic list or classification which includes *Pan*, and no proponent of the preservation of *Pan*, credit this generic name to a proper source or propose that it be preserved from a binomial author, and thus placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

Perhaps Mayr, Morrison-Scott, and others favouring preservation of *Pan* from Oken, 1816, are more concerned with the validation of Oken's *Lehrbuch* than with a valid name for the chimpanzee. Surely, most opposition to the use of *Pan* would dissolve were this name cited from its first correct usage for the chimpanzee, for example Palmer, 1904 (*Gen. Mamm.* : 508) and not from a zoologically dubious base and a nomenclatorially unacceptable work.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE GENERIC NAMES  
*MEGALICHTHYS* AND *RHIZODUS* (PISCES). Z.N.(S.) 1690  
(see volume 23, pages 117-120)

By E. I. White (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I agree entirely with Dr. Thomson's proposals, but the argument in favour of *Holoptychus nobilissimus* is incomplete as this species was originally described in 1835 as *Gyrolepis giganteus* L. Agassiz *Poiss. Foss.* 2 (1) : 175, pl. xix, fig. 13, and subsequently replaced in 1839 by *Holoptychus* (sic) *nobilissimus* L. Agassiz, in Murchison's *Silur. Syst.* : 600, pl. 11. bis., figs. 1, 2 (specific name *giganteus* withdrawn). The second action is illegal and must be properly put forward for the Commission to validate, particularly as the name *Holoptychius giganteus* was later used for another species (L. Agassiz, *Poiss. Foss.*, Vieux Grès Rouge, : 73, 140, pl. 24, figs. 3-10).

By Donald Baird (*Princeton University, New Jersey, U.S.A.*)

Let me voice strong support for K. S. Thomson's proposal to provide plenary sanction for the traditional application of the names *Megalichthys* and *Rhizodus* to the two most common crossopterygian fishes of the Carboniferous Period.

As Dr. Thomson justly points out, senseless confusion would result if the nearly universal usage of the past century were to be upset by nomenclatural pettifoggery.

His further proposal to validate current usage of the name *Holoptychius* is equally commendable. Confirmatory action by the Commission will be a boon to both specialist and non-specialist users of these generic names.